REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims pending in the application are requested.

Claims 1-43 are pending in the application. Claims 14-21 and 36- 43 have been allowed. Claims 1-13 and 22-35 have been rejected, as follows:

1) Claim 4 has been objected to for minor informalities.

2) Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 22, 23-26, 28-31 and 33-35 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by USP 6,845,097 to Haller et al, issued January 18, 2005, filed November 21, 2001 (hereafter "Haller").

3) Claims 5, 10, 27 and 32 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by USP 6,766,160 to Lemilainen et al., issued July 20, 2004, filed April 11, 2000 (hereafter "Lemilainen").

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 22, and 23 to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 102 (e). Claim 4 has been amended to overcome an informality objection. New claims 44- 49 have been added to obtain further protection for the disclosed subject matter.

Before responding to the rejection, Applicants would like to distinguish Haller and Lemilainen (the cited art) from the claimed subject matter ("Palin"), as follows:

A. Haller discloses a method for adding a first device to a short distance wireless network having a second device. A pairing message is provided to the second device. An identification symbol is provided to the first device and a short-range radio signal is generated containing the identification symbol to the second device from the first device. A communication channel between the first device and the second device is formed responsive to the pairing message and the identification symbol. Haller fails to disclose the claimed subject matter of Palin, as follows:

1. Haller discloses a system for forming, adding to and terminating mobile devices in a short distance wireless network. In contrast, Palin discloses setting up local services, e.g. email, printing, game playing, ticket purchases etc., as described at page 17, paragraph 0084 for mobile devices in a short range communication network. Haller is directed different subject matter than disclosed by Palin.

2. Haller discloses a second device added to a short range network after pairing of the second device with a first device based on a personal identification number of the second device matched by the first device. In contrast, Palin discloses a first device in a short range network stores service option information available to other devices in a short range network. Haller only discloses pairing of devises in a short range network and fails to disclose providing service options available to the devices in the network information.

3. Haller at column 7, lines 16-30 discloses a request for pairing within a short-range network is sent to a controlling entity in a long range network. Upon authorization for pairing, the controlling entity sends information back to the pairing devices via the long range network. Haller fails to disclose the actual authentication /authorization/securing of a wireless short-range communication link is performed locally as described in Palin at Paragraph 11.

B. Lemilainen discloses apparatus, and an associated method for facilitating authentication in a mobile communication system. The mobile communication system has a mobile terminal operable to communicate pursuant to a first radio communication system and to communicate pursuant to a second radio communication system. Authentication of the second radio communication system is facilitated. A storage element is coupled to the second radio communication system. The storage element stores indications of a secured identifier which identifies the mobile terminal in the second radio communication system. The indications of the secured identifier are accessible by the second radio communication system to be used in authentication procedures by the mobile terminal to authenticate the second radio communication system. Lemilainen fails to disclose the claimed subject matter of Palin, as follows:

1. Lemilainen discloses a mobile terminal storing an identifier, i.e. an address in an Intranet Location Register via a cellular system and using the identifier to perform authentication in a short range communication system. In contrast, Palin at paragraph 12 discloses preconfiguration information including an address of a remote short-range communications device, such as a Bluetooth device address (BD_ADDR). and may also include security information, such as a personal identification number (PIN), and/or one or more encryption keys. In addition, the preconfiguration information may include an identifier of an

offered short-range service, as well as an identifier indicating a location where the short-range service is offered. Lemilainen fails to disclose preconfiguration information.

Summarizing, Haller and Lemilainen, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a short-range network setting up local session between mobile devices using preconfiguration information from a long-range network wherein the preconfiguration information may include an identifier of an offered short-range service, as well as an identifier indicating a location where the short-range service is offered.

The rejection of claims 1-13 and 22-35 under 35 USC 102 (e) is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-13 and 22-35 are requested.

Now turning to the rejection, Applicants respond to the indicated rejections of the Office Action, as follows:

I. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 22, 23-26, 28-31 and 33-35, as amended, include features not disclosed in Haller and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 102 (e), as follows:

A. Claims 1 and 23:

(i) "receiving preconfiguration information over a long-range network, the preconfiguration information relating to the establishment of the local service session in the short-range wireless communication network and including service options;"

Haller at column 7, lines 7-10; 19-20 and column 6, lines 53-58 discloses storing PIN information in an Intranet Location register wherein the PIN information only provides the address of the mobile device for purposes of authentication, as described at column 6, lines 4-24. Haller fails to disclose preconfiguration information including service options.

(ii) "establishing the local service session in the short-range wireless communication network using the received preconfiguration information, after selection from the service options."

Applicants can find no disclosure in Haller relating to a mobile device setting up a session with another device, after selection of a service option, as described in Palin at paragraphs 50-53.

The rejection of claims 1 and 23 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 23 under 35 USC 102 (e) and allowance thereof are requested.

B. Claims 2 and 24. Haller at col. 6, lines 52-58 discloses entering PIN and other identification information in a web page and fails to disclose providing preconfiguration information including service options, as described in Palin in paragraph 12.

C. Claims 3 and 25. Haller at col. 7, line 8 discloses matching PINs and fails to disclose a description of a local service session as described in Palin at paragraphs 50-53.

D. Claims 4 and 26. Haller at col. 7, line 8 describes PIN information as an identifier and fails to disclose preconfiguration information as described in Palin at paragraph 12.

E. Claims 6-7 and 28-29. Haller at col. 7, line 8 discloses matching PIN information and fails to disclose preconfiguration information including security information, as described in Palin in paragraph 12.

F. Claims 8 and 30. Haller at col. 6, line 59 discloses an encrypted pairing message and fails to disclose preconfiguration information including a security key, as described in Palin in paragraph 12.

G. Claims 9 and 31. Haller at col. 7, liners 3-4 discloses comparing a stored PIN obtained in a pairing message with the PIN obtained from a Bluetooth message. Haller fails to disclose an identifier of an offered short-range service in preconfiguration information, as described in paragraph 12.

H. Claims 11 and 33 further limit claims 1 and 23 and are patentable on the same basis thereof.

I. Claims 12 and 34. Haller at col. 4, lines 64-66 discloses a WAN includes multiple LANs and /or short distance wireless networks connected over a relatively large distance. The cited disclosure does not inherently suggest an access point offering local service session. The rejection fails the test of inherency or common knowledge described in MPEP 2144.03. The cited MPEP states that it is not appropriate for an Examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference, where the facts asserted to be well known are

not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. Withdrawal of the rejection or the citation of a reference to sustain the rejection is requested.

J. Claims 13 and 35. Haller at col. 8, lines 54-64 describes smart terminals and thin terminals. The rejection of claims 13 and 35 based on inherency or common knowledge fails the test of MPEP 2144.03 discussed above in paragraph I. Withdrawal of the rejection or the citation of a reference to sustain the rejection is requested.

K. Claim 22. Haller discloses a wireless communications device (Fig. 3a), which fails to include features, as follows:

(i) a processor that executes instructions stored in the memory for:

receiving preconfiguration information over a long-range wireless network, the preconfiguration information relating to the establishment of a local service session in a short-range wireless communications network and including service options;

Haller in Fig. 3a discloses an application processor 301 and a Bluetooth processor 307 for processing software to transmit and receive cellular and Bluetooth signals, respectively. Applicants can find no disclosure in Fig 3a relating to the processors receiving preconfiguration information including service options.

(ii) "establishing the local service session in the short-range wireless communications network using the received preconfiguration information, after selection from the service options."

Applicants can find no disclosure in Fig 3a relating to the processors establishing a local service session after selection of service options in the preconfiguration information as described in Palin at paragraphs 50-53.

The cited art fails to disclose the features (i) and (ii) set forth above. The rejection of claim 22 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC 102 (e) and allowance hereof are requested.

II. Claims 5, 10, 27 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lemilainen.

A. Claims 5, 10, 27 and 32 are patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claims 1 and 23 from which they depend from and further limit. Lemilainen doe not provide the preconfiguration information; service options and selection of service options missing in Haller in establishing a communication session between mobile devices.

PATENTABILITY SUPPORT FOR NEW CLAIMS 44-47:

Claim 44 describes the subject matter of claim 14 in a device format. Claim 44 is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 14, which stands allowed.

Claim 45 depends from and further limits claim 44. Claim 45 is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 44.

Claim 46 describes a short-range network establishing a local service session in the short –range network upon successful link authentication. Haller discloses a controlling entity in a long range network sets up a local session between wireless communications devices in a short range network Haller fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 47.

Claims 47 and 48 depend from and further limit claim 46 and are patentable on the same basis as claim 46.

Claim 49 describes the subject matter of claim 46 in a device format. Claim 49 is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 46.

Entry of claims 44-49 and allowance thereof are requested.

CONCLUSION:

Having amended claims 1, 22 and 23 to further define and distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited art; amended claim 4 to cure an informality, and supported the patentability of New Claims 44-49, applicants request entry of the amendment; withdrawal of the rejection; allowance of the claims, and passage to issue of the case.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4135. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4135. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 9, 2006 By: Joseph C Redmond

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.
Registration No. 18,753
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
NewYork, NY 10281-2101